

special
COLLECTIONS
DOUGLAS
LIBRARY



QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA

CHURCH & KING:

A

THANKSGIVING SERMON

for the 29th of May:

Written in defence of our

Happy Constitution
in
Church & State.

with forcible Arguments against the

TOLERATION

of Heretics & Schismatics

By PASQUIN SHAVEBLOCK Esq^r
Shaver Extraordinary.



*O were it but his Majesty's commands
To give those gentle jaw-bones to these hands
I'd pay my Compliments to his Lordship's chin.*
Peter Findar.

LONDON,

Printed by W. Taylor, Black Friars;
Sold by J. Parsons, Paternoster Row;
and G. Riebau N^o. 439, Strand.

1795.

Noel & Strand.

AC 911. 1795. 549

DEDICATION.

TO THE

Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of LLANDAFF.

MY LORD,

BE not surpris'd that this Dedication varies from the usual style—your Lordship's character demands it.

Three crimes will hand down your name with execration to posterity among the cloth—So long as establishments exist, or Bishops to defend them.—You have pleaded for the UNIVERSAL TOLERATION of Heretics and Schismatics.—you have endeavoured to introduce INNOVATIONS, under the pretence of REFORMING the Church—and you have recommended the LEVELLING SYSTEM, by raising the salaries of the inferior Clergy at the expence of the higher orders.

These are sins not to be pardoned in a Bishop, and which will appear as incredible to posterity, as they would have done to your predecessors.

It is in hopes, that by a timely reformation, your Lordship will reconcile yourself to the Church, and atone for these injuries, that I subscribe myself,

Your Lordship's

Barber's Hall,

June 4, 1795.

Obedient humble servant,

PASQUIN SHAVEBLOCK.

Rubin 47
P. 115

P R E F A C E.

IT is a misfortune to Authors, that after they have taken all the pains in the world to be explicit and intelligible, for want of being able to give capacities to their readers, they are always liable to be misunderstood. Thus, notwithstanding the perspicuity of my style, and all my solemn assurances of sincerity, alas! there are not wanting some, even among professional critics, who will insist upon it that I was ironical, and meant to ridicule government, instead of supporting it. Alas! alas! is it then to be supposed impossible for any man to defend government in his sober senses! Or are all the arguments I have brought in defence of the war so ridiculous that they must be reckoned only in jest? What then are Mr. Pitt, Mr. Wyndham, and Mr. Dundas, who have used most of the same arguments, though with less skill---are they only in jest? What! spend the blood and treasures of the nation for a joke? Out upon it! ye Jacobin Reviewers! let me hear no more of it.

I have however the consolation not to be alone in this misfortune. Learned Mr. *Halbed* is in the same predicament as to his defence of Brothers, though nothing in the world can be clearer than that he is serious and in earnest---except that I am so!

I hope it will not offend the reverend *clergy*, who have so favourably received my first discourse, that I have made a second attempt at sermonizing, since they very well know, that the itch of preaching, like that of scribbling, is not easily cured: and if I prefer their profession to my own, as I certainly do (especially since the *new poll tax* has taken place), I hope they will not blame me for changing for the better.

My former was a *fast* sermon, and therefore adapted for the common people: this is a *festival* discourse, and therefore calculated for the higher classes. In both I have endeavoured to preserve the solemnity of the church style, though this latter may be a little more elevated and clerical, but I think not so much so as to occasion any dispute among posterity, whether they could be the production of the same author. And if I have approached a little nearer to the sublime and beautiful, I desire not to claim any merit from that circumstance, but to impute it partly to the dignity of my subject, and partly to the great authors I have perused on this occasion; such as the immortal Sacheverell, Sibthorpe, Mainwaring, and

particularly Dr. Gauden, whose name always reminds of the “perfume of the apothecary*,”—and that reminds me of my text.

* If the reader is curious to know my reason for associating these ideas of the doctor and the apothecary, he may find it in the following note, which contains an abstract of Dr. Gauden's glorious Sermon before the corporation of London at St. Paul's, 1639. The text is, Jer. viii. 11. “It has six parts—a patient, the sick church of England—her *hurt*—her *pretended healing*—the *cheat* of it—those magniloquent mountebanks, *fanatics*—and lastly, the *true way of healing* by that catholicon *episcopacy*.—The doctor's *patient* is “his daughter, his sister, his mother, a forsaken virgin, a rich married wife, and a poor desolate widow.”—This good lady has got “flesh wounds, ulcers, gangrenes, pustules, angry biles, running issues, and fistulas; she is plethoric, and consumptive; her spirits are flat, and her head is cracked; she has got the itch and the scratch, and her inward wounds are bleeding,” and in this miserable plight “some violent sons of Belial commit a horrid *rape* upon her.”—Presently they bring “*salves, elixirs, and diurnal doses, and sing lullaby.*” At last comes Dr. Gauden, and applies “lenitives, unguents, and poltices, and cleanses festered places, cures falling and fainting fits, and all the other *fedit*, which that unmannerly medicaster, the *devil*, had caused by his eruptions.” All this and ten times more, at St. Paul's Cathedral, before the Lord Mayor, and all the city magistrates—the several livery companies—the Lord General Monk—the clergy, gentry, *ladies*, and populous—by their humble servant, John Gauden, D. D. afterwards Lord Bishop of Exeter.” Quoted Robinson's Translation of Claud, vol. I. p. 384, 5.

CHURCH AND KING:

THANKSGIVING SERMON.

ECCLESIASTICUS xlix. 1.

“The remembrance of Josias is like the composition of the perfume, that is made by the art of the apothecary; it is as sweet as honey in all mouths, and as music at a banquet of wine.”

BE not surprised, Brethren, that I have chosen to address you on this occasion from a text selected out of the Apocrypha, since our Holy Church, recommends these books as containing excellent lessons of morality, and appoints them to be read in the public service “for the example of life, and instruction of manners.”——A learned Rabbi, *Nathan Ben Al Ed*, of the house of Judah, which hath lately arisen, also assures us that the prophecies therein are some of the most sublime and wonderful of the whole Bible.

The text, my brethren, is an eulogium on Josiah, king of Judah, the similarity of whose character with our ever-to-be-regretted Prince,

Charles II. is sufficiently obvious to every person acquainted with their history.

I shall not detain you long with exposition either of text or context: But it is necessary in a few words to explain the metaphors, and point out their propriety, not so much in reference to king Josiah, as to King Charles, to whom we shall chiefly apply them.—“The remembrance of” king Charles then “is like the composition of perfume,” made up of a variety of fragrant ingredients; so the recollection of his wisdom, piety, valour, patriotism, and other virtues, render his name fragrant to posterity.

“Like the perfume made by the art of the APOTHECARY.”—It may be objected, that some of the perfumes of our apothecaries are not the sweetest in the world: and it may seem as if some roguish fanatics had been tampering with the text, whose vitiated nerves mistook the scent of musk for *assifœtida*: but I rather think it only a mistranslation, and I could cite authorities to shew, that these apothecaries were perfumers, whose principal business in those days, (before the invention of washes and hair-powder), was to prepare the sacred incense for the priests.

“Like the taste of honey in all mouths”—which you know is very sweet; and this may signify that his name not only smells well in history; but that we still taste the sweetness of many of his virtuous actions, more particularly his zeal

for the Church, and his own Prerogative, which I shall have occasion to enlarge upon hereafter.

It is added—"as music at a banquet of wine." It is well known, that this most *religious* prince was very fond of banquets of wine, and frequently attended them: nor was he less fond of music. This "living example" of his father's "virtues and piety," as *learned* Mr. Playford calls him, shewed his love for this divine art, "by his encouragement of it, and the professors thereof: especially in his bountiful augmentation of the annual allowance of the gentlemen of his chapel,"—and presenting them with fine new cloaks.

Thus much for explaining my text, which I shall now drop, according to the modern method, and confine myself to the proposed subject of this discourse. It is notorious, that in the interval between the martyrdom of the blessed Charles I. and the restoration of his virtuous son, our government and constitution underwent many changes, and was reduced to a kind of republic, and that we owe the re-establishment of monarchy to the restoration of the King.

To-day we commemorate this event; and so happy an event is it considered, that, notwithstanding we exiled that royal family, to introduce another at the revolution, and have made it *Treason to pray for their descendants*, yet the church considers this as one of the most glorious of its festi-

vals—and I consider it as a very proper occasion to defend both the ecclesiastical and civil establishment—or in other words—the “CHURCH and KING” against all their enemies.

After having done this, I shall shew the sin and danger of *tolerating* heretics and schismatics, which are alike enemies to all establishments; and lastly conclude with forming an eulogium upon the character of our once-beloved King Charles II. drawn from these several topics.

The phrase *Church and King* may be differently understood—either as a *climax*, that is a climbing from the lower to the higher; or an *anticlimax*, that is a climbing down again. In many cases it is certain the Church takes precedence, but in others, as the King is *head* of the church, he seems to claim pre-eminence: but I shall shew, that there is such a mutual relation and dependance between them, as to leave no ground for jealousy or ill-will. The King is sworn to defend the Church, and the Church is bound to support the King. This is what our great Bishop *Warburton* calls, “the alliance between Church and State.” For as the famous Dr. *Sacheverell* observes, “Monarchy and episcopacy, the crown and the mitre, have been always so mutually depending upon a reciprocal union and support, that the fall of the one, drew after it the other, and the government of the state was never known to survive that of the church *.”

* Serm. on Political Union.

Firstly—I shall endeavour to defend the CHURCH.

It has been insinuated by the enemies of our Church, that it is of very obscure origin—that its first founder was a Carpenter, and his followers a set of low mechanics and sea-faring men; and I know there are some traditions of this kind in ancient history; but our clergy are wisely not ambitious to carry their origin so high, sensible that they can derive but little honour from that quarter; but are content to draw their pedigree from the golden age of Constantine, when the church was clothed in splendor, and its ministers elevated to wealth and honour.

It is true, that in the last century, many of the clergy crammed their sermons with old legends about the carpenter and his illiterate fishermen, and interlarded them with antique phrases from an obsolete history of his life; but the fashion of preaching is now so much improved, that they say as little as possible on these subjects, and confine their discourses to the more sublime ones of metaphysics and moral philosophy; omitting all such quotations, as tending to spoil the harmony and uniformity of their style. And, if at any time there is a necessity of mentioning that person, whose name is a harsh monosyllable, made up of very inharmonious consonants, they do it by way of circumlocution—not describing him as a crucified Mediator*—but endeavouring to ex-

* At a late examination for holy orders, a certain Prelate asked one of the candidates, if he knew any thing of a Medi-

hibit the fairest side of his character, as a Prince of the house of David, though reduced (and reduced princes are apt to excite respect); and instead of a poor itinerant field preacher, they represent him in the more respectable rank of a moral philosopher, like Socrates—or a legislator, like Solon; and a very good kind of man, who never did any harm that we know of*. But for the doctrine of the *Cross*, they have found it so great a stumbling-block to the politer part of mankind, that they have very charitably removed it out of the way, and you hear no more of it among the better sort of our clergy, than in a Turkish Mofque. Indeed considerable hopes are entertained, that when Christianity becomes a little more refined, it will meet with such a general reception, that neither Jews, Turks, nor Deists, will have any material objection to it.

But to return, it was in the glorious reign of Constantine, as I said, that the hierarchy was

ator—"Yes, my Lord, I believe there is one."—"Who is it?"—"The Archbishop of Canterbury, my Lord." Bishop Burnett complained, long since, "the much greater part of those who come to be ordained, are ignorant to a degree, not to be apprehended by those who are not obliged to know it. The easiest part of knowledge is that to which they are the greatest strangers; I mean the plainest parts of the Scriptures, which they say their Tutors in the Universities never mention the reading of to them."

* See the Bishop of Carlisle's Character of Christ.

formed in imitation of the civil government of the empire ; and the rulers of the church made to resemble in power and grandeur, the great officers of the state : priests were made into prelates—prelates primates—primates metropolitans, and lastly, Patriarchs, Papas, or Popes ; and I cannot conceive, for the life of me, why this latter title should fall into disuse among us, while the former are retained ; since it is certainly as harmless in itself ; and I know not why the Pope of Canterbury, York, or London, would not sound as well as the Pope of Rome, or the Patriarch of Alexandria.

It was very properly observed by the late *pious* Bishop WARBURTON, that the circumstances of CHRISTIANITY in the first ages were very different to what they are at present. Then she walked barefoot in the hard and thorny paths of persecution, now we have accommodated the lady with golden slippers. Then she was hooted at in every town she passed ; now she is received with the greatest politeness, and has, consequently acquired a taste of modern manners herself. Then it required great grace to believe and practise the new religion, now we can believe and act without any grace at all. Consequently, as the above prelate hath excellently shewn, all pretensions to *grace* at present are fanatical and enthusiastic ; howbeit, it is judged convenient to preserve the term itself in certain antique forms of devotion ;

but without any more definitive meaning than in the Thirty-Nine Articles.

This leads me to speak more particularly of the Church of *England*, of which I shall first present the reader with the beautiful portrait drawn by the excellent Dr. HEYLEN in the time of Queen Elizabeth.

“ Behold (says he) the government of the church by archbishops and bishops : these bishops nominated and elected according to the statute of the 26th Henry VIII. and consecrated by the ordinal, and confirmed by parliament, never appearing publicly but in their rockets; nor officiating otherwise than in copes at the holy altar; the priests never stirring out of doors, but in their square caps, gowns, and canonical coats, nor executing any divine office but in their surplice. The doctrine of the church reduced to its antient purity : the Liturgy conformed to the primitive pattern, and all the rites and ceremonies therein accommodated to the honour of God, and the increase of piety. Their festivals preserved in their former dignity, observed with their distinct offices, and celebrated with a religious concourse of all sorts of people : the weekly fasts, the holy time of Lent, the embering weeks, together with the fasts of the Rogation, severely kept by a forbearance from all kinds of flesh;— The holy table seated in the place of the altar —the people making their due reverence at their

entrance into the church; kneeling at the Communion: the confession and the public prayers; standing up at the Creed, &c.—the accustomed reverence at the name of Jesus—music retained in churches—and the most excellent voices that could be got in all the kingdom:—the altars furnished with rich plate, two fair gilt candlesticks, and a massy crucifix of silver in the midst thereof: which last remained there for some years till it was broke in pieces by Patch the fool,” no wiser man daring to undertake the business.

It would much exceed the limits of a Sermon to trace the history of the church through its successive ages to the present; especially as each would afford so much occasion for encomium on its ministers and princes. It would, however, be unpardonable wholly to pass them all over.

Elizabeth, it is known, was succeeded by James I. a *mon* and a king, equally eminent for his magnanimity, piety, and learning,—so much so as to be named a second *Solomon* among his courtiers*. This prince particularly merits our eulogy for the firmness and dignity with which he maintained his “prerogative royal”—forbidding his parliament to meddle with the “*deep* matters of state,” which it seems were “*far above* their reach

* This is said to have reached the ears of the French King Louis XIV. “Yes (said he) he is a *Solomon*—the son of David the sinner, and writes pamphlets on religion.”

N. B. David Rizzio was musician to Mary Queen of Scots.

and capacity ;” and very properly reminding them that all their privileges were derived from “ the grace and permission of his ancestors and himself,” and depended on his “ meet favour.”

Nor was his zeal less considerable in defending the church : and such was his fear of heretics, that he thought it necessary to caution the States of Holland against suffering *Arminius* to creep in among them *after he was dead*. As “ nursing father of the church,” he also advises them to burn the book of his disciple *Vorstius*, and recommends the same treatment of the author. His Majesty dedicated this famous book “ to the honour of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,” and subscribed himself, “ his most humble, and most obliged servant, JAMES, by the grace of God, King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith*.”

The majesty with which this great Prince moderated in the famous Hampton Court conference, between certain prelates and non-conformists, is well remembered by the descendants of the latter : and I hope none of us forget the piety he shewed in setting forth, in conjunction with his blessed prelates, the holy *book of sports*, which declared it to be the King’s pleasure “ that no lawful recreation be debarred to his good people—such as dancing,

* See Robinson’s *Claude*, vol. ii. p. 200: note.

archery, leaping, vaulting, &c." on the Sabbath day.

There is no doubt but that it was (as set forth in the declaration) " Out of the *like pious care* for the *service of God*, and for suppressing any humours that oppose *truth*, and for the *ease, comfort, and recreation* of his well-deserving people," that his most sacred majesty King Charles I. (of beatific memory) ratified and published " his blessed father's declaration" above-mentioned. It should not however be dissembled that the great Archbishop Laud comes in for a considerable share in the merit of this work, since he advised and enforced it to the utmost of his power; enjoining the strict observation of wakes and revels; and very properly reprovng and chastising fanatic preachers, who, by afternoon sermons, endeavoured to draw the people from their *holy* recreations, which greatly hindered the revels, and particularly " the utterance of the church *ale*."

This excellent Bishop, after a life of the most eminent services to the church and king, had the honour to obtain the crown of martyrdom in the same cause with his royal master.

The church fell with its great patron and supporter, and the times that followed were, as a certain great lawyer laments*, " equally fatal to

* Sir J. Hawkins's History of Music

monarchy and the *stage*"—and I may add,---the *church*: So that those three great interests fell together. For these wicked Republicans, having decollated the King, foolishly imagined they could also do without stage players and bishops:---the latter the great supporters of religion, as the former of good morals. They fancied that their Maker could hear their prayers when offered extempore, equally well as if they were chanted to an organ:---That, like as the sun shines with equal splendour on a cottage and a palace, so a pantile house was the same to him as a cathedral.

They were also blind to the utility of stage plays.---The fine moral strokes of *Congreve*, a *Jonson*, or a *Farquhar*, had no charms for them.

But I beg the readers pardon for this digression; however, I was led to it from the connexion between these subjects. The church and the theatre are alike schools of eloquence. Both are in great measure frequented by the same persons and for the same end--*amusement*. Our clergy frequently write for the stage, and are often the first to encourage it. To libel either is equally criminal---for whereas Bastwick and Burton had their ears cropt for writing against the hierarchy, Prynne, with equal justice, lost his for writing against the players. Furthermore, have we not many *comic* characters among the clergy?---many *pantomimic* ceremonies in the church? Is not the subscription to articles, which are not be-

lieved, a *farce*? and has not nonconformity sometimes proved a *tragedy*?

But to return---the restoration of our blessed monarch, Charles II. set all to rights again, and from his time the church has never wanted champions, and it is presumed never will, while she so generously rewards them.

Having now very slightly sketched the outlines of the history of the church, it is necessary I should proceed to a serious and argumentative defence of it.

The grand pretence of modern sectarists is the *inutility* of an hierarchy and an establishment; they pretend that religion always thrived best without, and they go as far as to say, that there is always most religion where none is established, as at present in America.----To this I shall reply by shewing the utility of our establishment in several points of view.

1st. An established hierarchy is highly useful to its *own members*. No dignitary of the church will dispute this. An establishment which maintains twenty-six bishops, as many deans and chancellors, and twice the number of prebends and canons, besides the various inferior ranks with appropriate salaries to each, from one to fifteen thousand *, or more per annum, must be of in-

* Fanatical preachers have always grumbled at this. Dr. Barnes, burnt for heresy in Queen Mary's reign.--"What Bishop can deserve by his labour a thousand pounds by the year,

finite service to those reverend persons, their connexions and dependencies; and as the beneficence and charity of great churchmen is proverbial, it is impossible to calculate how much good must arise from the annual circulation of two millions of church revenue.

2. The church is of infinite utility to our *nobility* and *gentry*, and that particularly in respect both of their *wives* and *children*. Not only *marriages*, but *divorces*, also are entirely owing to it. All trials for adultery and divorce are necessarily brought before it, no other court but their reverences being able to preserve sufficient gravity. And if we ought to value the happiness of being married, how much more the privilege of being unmarried again, with the opportunity of tying

and yet some of them have got a great deal more, and yet labour nothing at all. How dear would these men sell their labours, if they should be made tankard-bearers? They would make water dearer than wine! Yet tell me what labour there is within this realm, that is half so dear sold as their idleness is?"

So, *Peter Martyr*—“Now (saith he) many have large bishoprics and archbishoprics, and neither pray nor preach; nor do they think it any sin; for being admonished they answer their *vicars* perform those things.” So it is written, “The oxen were ploughing, and the asses feeding beside them.” Job i. 14.

Again, blunt old *Latimer*—“Since lording and loitering came up, preaching hath come down, contrary to the apostles time, for they preached and lorded not, and now they lord and preach not.”

the blessed noose a second time? As to the *children* of nobility, it sometimes happens, that peers are not able to give princely fortunes to all their children. Trade is a degradation. The army and navy require courage: the law and medicine capacity. But in the church neither is necessary. The youth that might not be able even to exist in those professions, may rise to eminence in the latter; and the man that may not do for a captain, a doctor, or a pleader, may yet make an excellent bishop.

3. The establishment is useful to the *Crown*. The cry of "No Bishops, no King," is not the random exclamation of a mob, as has been supposed; since without bishops we could have no kings; for kings are anointed, crowned, and sworn by bishops; and it is from their hands undoubtedly, (for it can be from no other), that they receive

"The *Right Divine* of doing *Wrong*;"

Or rather that *divine right*, which renders them incapable of doing wrong*; and makes them *un-*

* "The King can do no wrong." This is an undoubted maxim of our Constitution: and from thence, it follows that "there neither is, nor ever was that King that deserved the name of *tyrant*. They may safely violate all the laws of God and man: their very being Kings keep them *innocent*."

See *Milton's Defence of the People of England against Salmasius*, p. 16.

accountable (sometimes very much so) to all mankind.

4. There is another view in which the hierarchy is exceedingly serviceable to the *state*. It is well known that the great body of the clergy, except the poor curates and lecturers only, are tried and steady friends to the royal prerogative, and to the present happy establishment: and they have reason to be so, for they know they are not likely to derive any advantages from political reforms.

Such of these, therefore, as *preach*, uniformly support the doctrines of divine hereditary right—royal impeccability—and the wisdom and goodness of administration:—the necessity of implicit faith, and unconditional submission to Church and King, and the damnable nature of rebellion and sedition*.—As for those who are *above* preaching, as archbishops and bishops, these are no whit less necessary and useful in the House of Lords, where they are sure in all doubtful cases to throw a decisive majority on the right side—I mean the side of government. It is on this account, no doubt, that Mr. *Burke* informs us, “it is necessary that the *mitred* front should be exalted in courts and parliaments; and that dignified ecclesiastics, though

* Lord Clarendon very piously conjectured, that rebellion in PRIESTS, was the unpardonable sin against the Holy Ghost.

deficient in severe virtue, may be very useful men in the state."

I might shew the utility of the clergy in a variety of other points of view; but it is needless. Country gentlemen know how expert many of them are at hunting and shooting: corporations know their utility at public feasts; Members of Parliament can attest their influence in electioneering: but above all, the ladies can witness their accomplishments at assemblies, routs, and card parties.

5. The establishment is of infinite service to *religion* itself. In the first place, it is sufficiently notorious, that the greater part of this nation have no claim to be christians, but what they derive from being christened in their infancy, and perhaps confirmed by the bishop; and as without an establishment we should have no fonts, no true priests, no bishops, and consequently no confirmation: it therefore follows, as clear as any demonstration in Euclid, that we should have no christians at all—but all be heathens and Gentiles—except a few methodists and dissenters, who ordain and baptize one another*.

* Our Divines call the "canonical succession of the English ministry, the chief glory of our reformation. The Papists (says one) account our clergy *Laymen*, and call the whole order a royal and a parliamentary priesthood: while schismatics call us popish and antichristian ministers:"—thus—"the Church of England is crucified between these two

Again—it is owing to the *corporation* and *test acts* (those bulwarks of the church, and *butts* of all sectarists), that we have so many—I might almost say *any*—Christian senators, magistrates, or officers. For how could the rough drunken sportsman—the bullying lawyer—the votaries of Venus and the Graces—or the soldier full of “big oaths and blood”—not to name many other equally respectable characters which compose our great assemblies—how could these prove themselves Christians, had they not been sprinkled by a priest, or passed under the holy fingers of a bishop?

II. Having gone through my first general head, and defended our excellent church, though not with half the arguments I could have adduced; yet with as many as I think necessary.—I now proceed to the next branch of my subject, and shall, I hope, defend MONARCHY as successfully as I have done the Church.

Most historians derive monarchy from *Nimrod*, the son of Cush, the son of Ham, the son of Noah. A most venerable pedigree! Sir John Floyer however carries the origin of kings still higher, even to Adam the first, who reigned over all the birds and beasts in Paradise. Leaving this knotty point to be settled by those who have

thieves, and both vilify her; like *Isaachar* (a strong ass) she couches down between the two burdens, that Papists and Schismatics lay on her.” Fuller’s Can. Suc.

more skill in such questions, I shall content myself with the former origin for the present.

Nimrod, beloved, was “a mighty HUNTER,” and it is therefore, I suppose, that hunting is esteemed a royal sport to this day. Nimrod also was a mighty hunter “before the LORD.” Not being skilled in theological questions, which form no part of a modern university education, I am not able to speak dogmatically as to the import of the phrase. Perhaps it has some reference to his game, being of a more sacred nature than stags and foxes. Nero, I remember, hunted the *Christians*: Lewis XIV. his *protestant* subjects. But Nimrod was “a most religious and gracious king,” and perhaps hunted the *non-conformists*, like our king Charles II. At least this seems to be the idea of some very learned critics, whose works I have consulted.

I am not able to state fully and with precision, the rights and prerogatives with which these early princes were endowed; I suppose, however, they were much the same as have been claimed by their successors in latter times. At the institution of the Jewish monarchy, however, I am happily able to speak more exactly. *Samuel*, before he consecrated *Saul*, the first king of Israel, thus states his prerogative. [1 Sam. viii. 10--17.] And he said——

“This will be the manner of the KING that

E

“ shall reign over you : he will take your sons
 “ and appoint them for himself, for his chariots,
 “ and to be his horsemen, and some shall run
 “ before his chariots. And he will appoint
 “ him captains over thousands, and captains
 “ over fifties, and will set them to ear his ground,
 “ and to reap his harvests, and to make his
 “ instruments of war, and instruments of his
 “ chariots. And he will take your DAUGHTERS
 “ to be confectionaries, and to be cooks, and to
 “ be bakers.

“ And he will take your FIELDS, and your vine-
 “ yards, and your olive yards, even the best of
 “ them, and give them to his servants. And he
 “ will take the TENTH of your seed, and of your
 “ vineyards, and give them to his officers, and
 “ to his servants.

“ And he will take your men-servants, and
 “ your maid-servants, and your goodliest young
 “ men, and your asses, and put them to his works.
 “ He will take the tenth of your sheep, and YE
 “ SHALL BE HIS SERVANTS.”

Thus far the prophet of what kings *should* be,
 now how well the events have answered his pre-
 dictions, both sacred and profane history suffi-
 ciently evinces ; and I could easily shew you, if
 time permitted ; but I shall content myself with
 citing the oration of the wise young Persian in
 the presence of ~~the~~ great *Darius*, which is equally

applicable to some other monarchies as to that of Persia. [1 Esdr. iv. 2—12.]

“ O ye men, do not men excel in strength that
 “ bear rule over sea and land, and all things in
 “ them? But yet the KING is more mighty: for
 “ he is Lord of all these things, and hath domi-
 “ nion over them, and whatsoever he commandeth
 “ them they do: if he bid them make war *the*
 “ *one against the other*, they do it: if he send them
 “ out against the enemies, they go, and break
 “ down mountains, walls, and towers. They slay
 “ and are slain, and transgress not the king’s com-
 “ mandment: if they get the victory, they bring
 “ all things to the king, as well the spoil as all
 “ things else.

“ Likewise for those that are no soldiers, and
 “ have not to do with war, but use husbandry;
 “ when they have reaped again that which *they*
 “ had sown, they bring it to the king, and com-
 “ pel one another to pay tribute to the king*.

* I know not how to speak with sufficient indignation of the following extract from a church dignitary of the present age— Surely he can never hope to be a Bishop!

“ If you should see a flock of pigeons in a field of corn, and if (instead of each picking where, and what it liked, taking just as much as it wanted, and no more), you should see ninety and nine of them gathering all they got into a heap; reserving nothing for themselves, but the chaff and refuse; keeping this heap for one, and that the weak, perhaps, and worst pigeon of the flock, sitting round and looking on all winter, whilst this one was devouring, throwing about, and wast-

“ And yet he is but one man ; if he command
 “ to kill, they kill ; if he command to spare, they
 “ spare ; if he command to smite, they smite ;
 “ if he command to make desolate, they make
 “ desolate ; if he command to build, they build ;
 “ if he command to cut down, they cut down ;
 “ if he command to plant, they plant.

“ So all his people, and his armies obey him ;
 “ furthermore, he lieth down, he eateth and
 “ drinketh and taketh his rest ; and these keep
 “ watch round about him, neither may any one
 “ depart and do his own business, neither disobey
 “ they him in any thing.

“ O ye men, how should not the king be
 “ mighty, when in such sort he is obeyed !”

If we come home to modern times and to our
 own country, we find the same claims recognized
 and established. For instance---Did the ancient

ing it ; and if a pigeon, more hardy and hungry than the rest,
 touched a grain of the hoard, all the others instantly flying
 upon it, and tearing it to pieces ; you will see nothing more
 than is practised every day among men. Among men you see
 the ninety and nine toiling and scraping together a heap of
 superfluities for one ; getting nothing for themselves all the
 while, but a little of the coarsest of the provision which their
 own labour produces, and this one too, oftentimes the feeblest
 and worst of the whole set ; a child, a woman, a madman, or
 a fool ; looking quietly on, while they see the fruits of all their
 labour spent or spoiled ; and if one of them take or touch a
 particle of it, the others join against him, and hang him for
 the theft.”

Paley's Mor. and Pol. Phil. vol. 1.

Kings claim the right of making war and peace whenever they pleased? This is the unquestionable prerogative of ours.---Did they *impress* the people into their service whenever they found occasion? And have not our Kings the same power? ---Did they exact contributions and levy supplies whenever their necessities required? And have not several of our Princes of the illustrious House of the Stuarts done the same*?---Finally, did they dispense with laws, and revoke or change them when they thought proper? Hear the following unanimous opinion of all our great law authorities in the reign of King James II. wherein the twelve Judges declare it to be the law and constitution of this country :

“ That the Kings of England are sovereign Princes.

“ That the laws of England are the King’s laws.

“ That therefore it is an incident, inseparable prerogative in the Kings of England, as in all other sovereign Princes, to dispense with penal

* Bishops Niele and Andrews being at dinner with King James in public, his Majesty proposed the question, whether he might not take the money of his subjects without consent of parliament? “ God forbid you should not, (said Niele) for you are the breath of our nostrils.”—Andrews at first declined answering, but being urged, replied pleasantly, “ I think your Majesty has an undoubted right to my brother Niele’s money.”

laws in particular cases, and upon particular necessary reasons.

“ That of those reasons, and of those necessities, the King himself is the sole judge. And

“ That this is not a trust invested in, or granted to the King by the people, but is the ancient remain of the sovereign power and prerogative of the Kings of England, which never yet was taken from them, nor can be.”

Another of the choicest prerogatives of our Kings, in which I think they exceed the ancients, is that of making Peers and Bishops: the latter indeed, unhappily for the clergy, are limited, or we might have as many Bishops as market towns in the kingdom; but of the former, the crown has an unlimited prerogative. Formerly, it is true, the people were jealous of this right, and the creation of twelve Peers at once in Queen Anne's reign, gave a general alarm; but during the present administration, though we have had more than fifty new ones, it has given no more alarm, than if they were excise officers or justices of the peace.

If it be objected that these principles lead to the subversion of our liberties, and the establishment of arbitrary power and slavery, I answer,

1. That those liberties however they have been admitted in *theory*, have never been fully established in *fact*, nor indeed can be, with safety to

the government ; and if one must give way, there is no doubt but it should be the former.

2. I consider what is called *arbitrary power* but the just right of the Sovereign, and I think this has been abundantly proved by the ablest writers, both in church and state ; nor is there any part of that prerogative but has been well supported by Laud, Montague, Sibthorp, Mainwaring, Sacheverell, Horsley, and a thousand others in the church ; and by Clarendon, Hume, Smollet, Burke, &c. out of it.

3. I conceive that what is opprobriously stiled *slavery*, but should be servitude or subjection, is the natural, original, and happiest state of mankind.

That it was the original state of man, may be inferred from history. Were not all the ancient monarchies absolute ? Were not all servants and all subjects slaves ? Nay, is not this the case with more than nine tenths of the world at present ?— Is not this principle also natural to man ? Do not those who cry out the loudest against tyranny assume it whenever they have an opportunity ? Were not Cromwell and Robespierre tyrants ?

I said that a state of slavery or servitude is the happiest for mankind ; and has not this been demonstrated by many of the writers in defence of the slave trade ? But I appeal to facts.—Are not the negroes more happy labouring in our West-India islands, than in their own country,

where they destroy and sometimes sacrifice each other? Are they not more happy in *our* islands, where they are doomed to everlasting slavery, than in the *French* islands, where they are set at liberty? Nay were not the French themselves much more happy when they were dancing to the honour of their Grand Monarch, than at present fighting for their liberties?

Indeed the great causes of political misery are *liberty* and *knowledge*: without the latter, men know not the loss of the former; and as it is the practice of bird-fanciers to extinguish the sight of their little captives to make them sing the better; so should it be the first object of a wise minister, to keep the people in ignorance; since from the dissemination of knowledge, has arisen all the confusion we see lately introduced in Europe. Ignorance is the mother both of devotion and subjection: and men were never so happy as when they left the care of their souls to the priests, and resigned all their other concerns to government.

But as it is perhaps not practicable to close the eyes of mankind at once, and as the learning to read has unhappily become general, and people having learned, will read,—I would strongly recommend the dissemination of such works as have the happiest tendency to becloud the mind, and restore the ancient darkness; such particularly as the late writings of Mr. Burke, Monsieur Ca-

lonne, and those published by the Crown and Anchor Society.

On the other hand, I think it would be necessary to suppress gradually the licentiousness of the press, by appointing proper licensers in the different departments of literature; as for instance, Dr. Prettyman, for divinity; in politics, Mess. Burke and Reeves; and for the newspaper department, some of the Treasury clerks, who are used to that business; and as all these gentlemen enjoy considerable emoluments from government, they might probably undertake their several departments on the more reasonable terms.

It might also perhaps assist this work, if a proper reward were offered for publishing works in the learned and foreign languages, except the French and Dutch; by which means the press might be kept at work, without any material injury to the public.

III. I am now to shew the sin and danger of TOLERATION.

Among the various errors of the present day, there is none more fatal than this. It is an error that lays the axe to the root of all *uniformity* in religion, and must sooner or later prove fatal to every ecclesiastical establishment where it prevails.

Our divines have very properly opposed this notion with a variety of convincing arguments.

If there be such a thing as truth, if truth be of that value and importance which we all confess, then ought every possible means to be used for its support, and for the suppression of error.

Again, heresy and schism are *sins*—sins of the *deepest* die: to plead therefore for the toleration of these, is to be an advocate for *sin*, yea for the *greatest* sin—at which every good man must certainly shudder with aversion.

Heretics and schismatics, I know, are not aware of the danger of being without the pale of the episcopal church; but think faith and good works may save them notwithstanding; but we who see their danger, ought by all means to urge them, and if need be, even “COMPEL them to come in.”

Tenderness of conscience is, forsooth, the grand plea with dissenters. Not to say that this is generally a false pretence, it ought to be considered that “private persons have no right to judge in such cases; that they are not masters of their own actions, nor ought they to be governed by their own judgment: but they ought to be directed by the public conscience of their governors. If the magistrate enjoins any thing sinful, he, and not the people who submit to the imposition, is accountable to God for it.*” And, therefore, “it is safer to err with our church governors, than to separate from them †.”

* Parker's Eccles. Pol.

† Hicckeringill.

However, as the learned Dr. Butler says,

“ No argument like matter of fact is.*”

I shall therefore reason from this most unexceptionable topic, and prove, that, in the sense I have stated it, *Toleration* is

1. Contrary to the spirit of *all establishments*: for if it be of no consequence to the state what a man's religious sentiments are, wherefore establish any? and if it be of importance, why tolerate the contrary?

But let us advert to history. The Jewish religion, we know, tolerated no worship but its own; but as this instance may be objected to as unfair, on account of their government being a Theocracy, we do not rest here, but pass on to the other ancient establishments.

To begin with the grand Assyrian or Babylonian monarchy, (though I might go higher) it is clear that no toleration was admitted there even for foreigners or nobles; for when the three Jewish youths refused to worship the golden image of Nebuchadnezzar, they were, although rulers of provinces, immediately cast alive into the fiery furnace. So under the Persian monarch, Daniel could not be tolerated to worship his own God, but was cast into the den of lions, for his non-conformity.

Nor was the matter altered under the Greeks.

* Hudibras.

Witness the persecution which the Jews suffered from Antiochus and others, for adhering to the religion of their fathers. Neither were the Christians treated more tenderly by the Romans, who persecuted thousands of them to imprisonment, torture, and death.

Persons but little acquainted with history may suppose, perhaps, that the authors of these persecutions must have been the most cruel and uncivilized of mankind; but this is far from being generally true. Not only Nero and Domitian, but the just and temperate *Trajan*, the mild and philosophic *Marcus Aurelius*, persecuted; and the latter, in particular, persevered in it to the end of his reign. Persons of the best dispositions, the most elegant taste, and refined manners, often took an active part in scenes that would shock the feelings of a gang of Smithfield drovers. And on what principles?—None other than piety to the gods, and zeal for the public welfare.—They saw the utility of an established religion, and thought it necessary to the public peace, that it should be supported:—They were convinced, that if Christians (such as those times produced!) were suffered to live, and to live in peace, their establishment must come down:—yea, they confessed and lamented, that their temples were forsaken, the sacrifices neglected, and that the *priests* and *craftsmen* were in danger of being starved.—*Hinc illæ lachrymæ!* These are the miseries of

Toleration! And I am thoroughly convinced, brethren, that, however our feelings may revolt at it, a similar line of conduct is necessary for us; for if we once allow sectarists the same liberty of conscience as ourselves, and make the support of our church optional, as they would have it, the establishment must come down—the revenue of the church fail—and our priests and prelates must be sent to beg their bread like those of France.—Priests, Prelates, Statesmen, awake! arise! and call upon your God!

But to return.—It might be, and probably was expected, that when Christianity became the established religion of the empire, persecution would be no more: but this leads me to observe,

2. That Toleration is equally contrary to the practice of the *Christian church*; for no sooner was it *established* than it began to persecute, or persecute, heretics and dissenters, and has persevered in it more or less ever since. Early in the fourth century Arius and his followers were imprisoned and banished: Their books burned, their churches demolished, and their property confiscated by the orthodox. The Priscillians, Donatists, and many other sects came in for the same fate, and in a few years it was improved to torture, and even death. Christian princes and holy prelates united in this glorious cause, and vied with each other in demonstrations of their zeal and piety! Hundreds—

thousands—hundreds of thousands—millions—were, in one manner or other, offered up in sacrifice to the God of Peace and Love !

This it must be confessed was going too far, and has rendered the church of Rome, which was very active in this business, odious to posterity.

Our reformers complained bitterly of this, while they felt it, but afterwards they found a necessity of adopting the same principle, though with more moderation, in order to preserve their new establishments. Presbyterianism was established in Geneva ; and notice was given to all the popish priests, to abjure their old *mumpsimus* within three months, and conform, or fly. *Calvin* himself concurred with the magistrates to burn *Servetus*, an unitarian heretic.

In England episcopacy was the establishment, and *Cranmer* burned several anabaptist heretics for non-conformity to the new religion, though sorely against the will of the chicken-hearted Prince Edward. But Queen Elizabeth (not to name Mary, because she was a papist—Elizabeth) joined heartily in the work of suppressing heretics and non-conformists. The papists she hanged for treason—Anabaptists she burnt for heresy—and Puritans and noncons she threw into prison in great numbers, and many left the country. This blessed work was carried on in the same spirit through the succeeding reigns of the Stuart fa-

mily ; more than twenty thousand dissenters were compelled to seek refuge in America, and many languished and perished in confinement.

One thing here I beg leave to observe that reflects great honour on this work, namely, that many of the persons concerned in it were of the most amiable manners and dispositions : such were Calvin and Cranmer, and therefore could not act from any evil propensity : and that others acted in direct opposition to their own interests, and compelled themselves to do violence to their own feelings, so that no tie of interest, natural affection, gratitude, or moral duty could restrain them : thus the pious Louis XIV. lost by persecution six hundred thousand useful citizens, and manufacturers, and was so far from regretting this, that he said, “ such is my zeal for converting heretics, that if it requires me with one hand to cut off the other, I will do it.” The proper inference from these facts is, that nothing less than zeal for God and religion was the motive of their conduct, and that when they destroyed their fellow christians, it was from a clear conviction that it was their duty so to do. Can we then act from better motives ? or need we wish the sanction of more eminent examples ?

At the revolution it was judged necessary to enact very severe laws against the papists, and that for this good reason, that, when they had the power in their own hands, they enacted very

severe ones against us. And so convinced were all parties of the necessity of this measure that the dissenters themselves cheerfully acquiesced under many inconveniences and incapacities, rather than the papists should be exempted from them. At the same time, it must be confessed, some countenance was shewn to protestant dissenters; but a certain Irish Dignitary tells us, that “What men call the *Toleration Act* takes away some penalties inflicted by former acts on the dissenters: but it does not repel or weaken one tittle of the act of uniformity. *Schism* like murder, remains a *dammable* sin although all punishment be taken away. There is not one word of *toleration* in that statute called the *Toleration Act* *.” And it should be remembered there are still existing severe laws against heresy, though government does not think proper at present to enforce them.

3. Heretics and schismatics seldom tolerate one another. Not only did the orthodox persecute the Arians, &c. in the primitive church; but also the Arians so soon as ever they acquired the power, persecuted the orthodox, even to imprisonment, banishment, and death. Thus did Valens in the fourth century; and afterwards Genferic and some of his descendants; one of them (Thrasimund) carried his zeal so far, as when on his death-bed, to exact an oath from his successor, that he would never tolerate the Athanasians.

* Prebendary Higgins's Sermon at Whitehall, 1707.

We have already mentioned the conduct of Calvin to Servetus—we may add, that even Socinus acted in just the same spirit to his brother heretic Davideis, though he had not the power, nor the provocation to carry his severity so far.

We have mentioned the treatment of the Non Cons. under James and Charles I. We may add a similar line of conduct in the Presbyterians towards the Episcopalians during the long rebellion, when they sequestered their livings, excluded them from the church, and prohibited their use of the Common Prayer Book under very severe penalties; and the ministers of London and Gloucestershire published their protest, against the damnable heresy of Toleration. They call it, “The *error of Toleration*, patronizing and supporting all other errors, heresies, and blasphemies whatsoever, under the grossly abused notion of liberty of conscience*.” It was under this influence that the English parliament in 1648, made several species of heresy (particularly Socinianism) *felony* without benefit of clergy; and in consequence, the penalty of it—*death* †.

During Oliver Cromwell’s usurpation, the Jews applied for protection and toleration, but the di-

* Neal’s Hist. of the Puritans.

† “New Presbyter is but old priest wrote large.”

MILTON.

vines who had pleaded so forcibly for toleration when themselves were persecuted, now they were consulted, took the other side of the question. So Oliver followed his own opinion, and begged their prayers.

Upon the whole then we see that the necessity of restraint in matters of religious opinion has been *practically* supported by all parties; whatever outcry has been made against it as cruelty and persecution by the sufferers, yet no sooner have the tables been turned and power in their hands, but they have practised and defended it; so that it should seem, as Luther used to say, "Every man is born with a Pope in his belly,"—and that "we hate the Pope at Rome, because we all want to be Popes ourselves."

It is only among the factious *Americans* who rebelled and revolted from us, and among the atheistical *French* who care for no religion at all, that this dangerous notion of religious liberty fully prevails. There only (and but lately there) universal toleration is admitted as a principle of government, and one of the rights of man*.

* "The right of private judgment, in the extent in which it is claimed, and exercised by some of the modern non-conformists, is a position to be denied. It is not acknowledged in any such extent by the church of England, nor by the Calvinistic churches of Scotland, Holland, or Geneva. It is not acknowledged by the episcopal church of America; nor can it be acknowledged *without restriction*, more or less, by

Lastly, Let us bring home the subject to the present times and circumstances. The Irish papists, now eclipsed Catholic dissenters; solicit—I may say, *demand*—a full and complete toleration—or in other words, an equality of rights and privileges with ourselves—the question is—*shall we grant it them?*

Now consider, the case (first) as a point of religion---I have clearly demonstrated that such a liberty is repugnant to the fundamental principles of all establishments; namely, that one only religion can be right, and that the supreme magistrate alone is the proper judge of this.

(2.) Consider it a question of equity---the papists never tolerated us, and therefore we ought not to tolerate them.

(3.) Consider it on the ground of benevolence and humanity. We know popery to be idolatrous, and that idolatry is a mortal sin: it is therefore for their good that we restrain papists, and it ought to be considered as a proof of our love and compassion to their souls.

(4.) Consider it on the ground of policy, and the probable consequences of granting their re-

any established church in Christendom.—It becomes the friends of peace and order in church and state, whenever this universal acknowledgment of the right of private judgment, is pretended, to protest loudly against it.”

Bishop Horsley's Rev. of the Case of Profl. Dissenters.

quests. The first consequence is, that so great a body of new electors, as this would give to the Irish House of Commons, might materially affect the British interest in that house, and greatly weaken if not overpower the influence of ministry. Who then can say, what would be the result? Perhaps a majority in that kingdom might oppose the war, and refuse the needful supplies; and thus while poor England is left to fight alone, Ireland might open her arms to give the fraternal embrace to our natural enemy.

But further--the present requisition seems only part of a more extensive plan. This point gained, it is not possible to say how far they might carry their reforms. Their next step would probably be a reform in the House of Commons. This might produce a reduction of the pension list; and of the influence and salaries of the executive government.

But we have not only to consider the consequences in Ireland: we must also look at *home*. If we give liberty to the *Catholic dissenters* in Ireland, what can we say to the *Protestant dissenters* in England? Will not they expect the same privileges? And may not our tame acquiescence in the demands of the former, excite the like requisition from the latter?

Nor is this all: the state as well as the church will be endangered. If we give way to political reforms in Ireland, can we be able to withstand

them here? If we admit their legality there, can we make the same thing treason here? Certainly not. And if reforms, or innovations, are admitted either there or here, Heaven alone knows where the mischief may spread at last.

To conclude this part of my subject—I think there are the strongest reasons in the world for government to be firm and inflexible; and to imitate the steadiness of our church rulers, with respect to the dissenters—yield in nothing, however small and inconsiderable; since one innovation may make room for another—and so on *ad infinitum*.

I know that some timid politicians think otherwise; and fear that if nothing is yielded, all may be taken. In short they fear that Ireland will copy the example of America. Be it so: we can do without her, as we have done without the other. I do not speak this, however, to discourage or alarm. If they will rebel, be it at their peril. No blood or treasure should be spared to humble them: and if we give up at last, let it be with the same honour as in the other case.

IV. Finally, I come now to improve my subject by sketching the outlines of the portraiture of his sacred Majesty King Charles II. whose restoration we this day joyfully commemorate, and to attempt a feeble and (I am sensible) inadequate panegyric on his virtues—a subject worthy the “sublime and beautiful” genius of a *Burke*!

The eulogy of this prince must be formed from a survey of the leading incidents of his life, in which I propose very briefly to demonstrate that throughout he shewed—a most laudable zeal in defence of the established church—a proper firmness in the support of the royal prerogative—and a most righteous severity against all sectaries and fanatics.

To form a just idea of his excellent character, we must take our first view from that awful period, When, as one of our right orthodox divines* observes, “The breath of our nostrils, the anointed of the Lord [King Charles I.] was barbarously murdered before his own palace; and the royal family sent to seek their bread in foreign countries.

“The lawful heir solemnly abjured, and a price set upon his head; he underwent a forced extirpation for many years, by the most traitorous conspiracies, and armed power of usurping tyrants, and execrable perfidious traitors—as the act for observing this day expresses it*.”

After a dozen years of storms and tempests however, it pleased Heaven to give him “a wonderful, glorious, peaceable, and joyful restoration to the actual possession and exercise of his undoubted, hereditary, sovereign, and regal authority over them; and notwithstanding all the malice of his enemies, with him, and by him, God restored to us [of

* Rev. Luke Milbourne's Serm. May 29, 1716.

the established church] the free profession of his sacred truth and gospel, together with our former peace and prosperity.”

Speculative reformers, as your Priestleys, Prices, and Tom Paines, talk of an original contract between prince and people, and on this they found their revolutionary principles. But here was no contract—no bargain---no stipulations---he came as a prince, and in that character they received him.---The former notion is no doubt atheistical, and can only be maintained, as Dr. *Nicholls* long since observed, on atheistical principles.

His claim to the crown and kingdom was the best that a King can have---it was hereditary*---he derived it from his ancestors as some of us do our estates, and as others of us do our flocks and herds. He had consequently the same right to an absolute disposal of his subjects; and it is evident, from the whole tenor of his reign, he thought so, and endeavoured to bring his people into the same opinion with himself; and not without success, particularly among the clergy, who almost unanimously preached the divine doctrines of *non-*

* The pedigree of this prince was made remarkably clear by Mr. *Roderic O'Flaberty*, an Irish gentleman, who traced his descent in a right line from *Adam!* and proved, with equal evidence, that his sacred Majesty's family had reigned in this part of the world full 2700 years!!!

Quoted Robinson's *Claude*, vol. i. p. 327.

resistance and *passive obedience*, and fulminated all the curses of the church against the factious advocates of liberty and reform.

One of the first and best events of this reign was the restoration of the fallen hierarchy, and the re-instatement of the surviving bishops to their respective sees, which at this time proved remarkably productive, from the great number of new leases they had to grant. It was not therefore without reason that they, as well as their successors, have called this "the best constituted church in all the world."

His majesty was too sensible of the blessings of episcopal government not to wish to extend them as far as his dominions: he therefore was graciously pleased to impart them to his subjects beyond the Tweed; who it must be confessed, received and returned his favours in a very ungrateful manner, *curfing* all his *blessings*, and evil entreating those he sent to propagate them. Such alas! is the ingratitude of some people to their kindest benefactors! His majesty persevered, however, in his benevolent intentions, and crushed with a rod of iron those who refused to kiss the sceptre of his favor.

Next to his majesty's zeal for the church, must be ranked his energy and firmness in support of his own royal prerogative, and the rights of kings, which he maintained in a manner truly worthy of himself. It merits also our remark that

whereas his majesty was graciously pleased to first raise the fallen church before he assumed the full extent of his own perogatives; so the clergy were by no means ungrateful in their turn, but exerted all their learning, eloquence and authority to raise the power and glory of the throne.

Those acquainted with history know the great impertinence of parliaments in those periods; who frequently disputed the royal authority, and presumed to call to account the servants of the crown, not remembering that no man has authority over another's servants. They were also so inquisitive as to pry into the king's private expences, and the charges of the kitchen and nursery, to the great offence of majesty, and of all his friends.—How happy is it that we have no such parliaments at present; but that both our houses are so far improved in politeness and a proper sense of their duty as to go regularly through the public business, without asking or suffering any impertinent questions.

Had we a House of Commons, for instance, like some in the reigns of the Stuarts, before they had provided for six hundred and twenty thousand pounds of royal debts, they would have asked, perhaps as many impertinent and indecent questions;—they might have wanted to know how they were contracted, and to whom they were owing—what value had been

received, or what interest had been given---the answers to which might have been equally mortifying both to prince and people : but, thank our stars, our parliaments are both more loyal, more wise, and more polite !

Every age, however, is fruitful in sedition. Treason and rebellion are weeds that grow in every soil and in every season. Those times produced a Hampden, a Russell, and a Sydney, with many others of the same clan; unhappily our times have produced a Stanhope, a Horne Tooke, and a Tom Paine ; men equally inimical to our happy establishment, and to the rights of kings and priests—though alas! we have not been equally successful in procuring them the same justice with the former ! With whom the fault may lay that treason and sedition are thus triumphant, I will not say—but I will say, it lays not with our government.

There was one political measure in this reign, which appears to me so wise and so important that I beg leave to recommend it to our present excellent and virtuous administration---I mean the suppression of all political debate at coffee-houses. If this measure were adopted now, I conceive it must be extended to every kind of public-houses, from the St. Alban's tavern to the pot-houses in the city. I know that some feeble attempts of this nature were made by a late worthy Lord Mayor, and some of the justices of

the peace, but their authority is too weak, unless supported by an act of parliament, or at least a royal proclamation, which comes to the same thing. I am aware this would require a great number of spies, or informers, so vulgarly called; but I conceive those employed against the corresponding societies, and upon the new poll-tax, would be sufficient; or if not, they might easily be increased; and the expence put down under the general head of *secret expences*, especially as there is no danger of Parliament making any troublesome enquiries.

The last grand trait in the character of our excellent King Charles II. is the zeal with which he opposed and suppressed the schismatics. His majesty's zeal for the established protestant religion is certainly the more praise-worthy from its being disinterested, as it is very well known, that this prince had no religion of his own, or at least if he had, it was not the protestant. Of all religions however, it is certain his majesty most hated that of the puritans and presbyterians, not so much, as himself used to say, for the learned reasons urged by his bishops, as because it was a religion by no means *fit for a gentleman*.

It was in this reign, that the pious bishops procured a regular code of penal laws, on the occasion and utility of which, I shall offer a few mo-

deft remarks, especially as fome of them are now obfolete and almoft forgotten.

The first of thefe was the *Corporation act*, by which all laymen, who refused conformity to the Church of England were excluded from the *Corporation dinners*. Some persons may think this a very mild penalty for an offence fo heinous; but thofe muft think otherwise who witnessed the terror and confufion very lately occafioned in the Common Council of this city, by a motion to fufpend all civic dinners during the prefent high price of meat.

The next act was that of *Uniformity*, which was particularly aimed at the *Clergy*. It excluded from the fervice of the church, all fuch as did not within a particular day (St. Bartholomew's, 1662) publicly avow their affent and consent to the Common Prayer, Articles, &c. About two thousand refused, and were expelled. The cafe of fome of thefe was thought rather hard, becaufe in fome diftant parts of the kingdom it was impoffible they could by the day procure a fight of the book they were to certify their approbation of. This however was not material to the defign of the act, which was evidently to exclude all nice and fcrupulous confciences, and by their removal, to make room for thofe who had no fcruples at all; fince it is highly neceffary in all eftablifhments for its minifters to be ready to fubfcribe any thing their church governors may require.

The next was the *Conventicle act*, which inflicted a fine or imprisonment for attending any of the clandestine meetings of the fanatics, and for the third offence transportation.

These laws occasioned great murmurings and much "complaining in our streets," by those who were excluded from preaching in our churches. To remedy this, therefore, another law was enacted forbidding them to come within five miles of any town or city in the kingdom; concluding, no doubt, very justly, as a certain writer remarks, that "those could never complain in the streets, who did not come within five miles of a town!"

Lastly, the *Test act* required all persons enjoying places of trust and profit to receive the holy sacrament in some parish church, within a certain limited time. This particularly applied to officers in the army and navy:—a use of that ordinance more than was thought of in its original institution. And certainly, if that sacrament possess any sanctifying virtue, as some divines affirm, no persons more stand in need of it than soldiers and sailors; and the reception of that holy ordinance is certainly a very proper preparation for the shedding *human blood!!!* So in the holy Roman church this sacrament has been commonly administered to ecclesiastical assassins, at the consecration of their weapons.

Nor were these acts mere bugbears, nor suffered

to sleep, like some other penal laws upon our statute books. “ During the reigns of Charles and James II. above 60,000 non-conformists suffered, 5000 of whom died in prison : on a moderate computation they were pillaged (as they call it) of fourteen millions of property *.”

During all this time our church heralds trumpeted the divine right of monarchy and episcopacy through all the corners of the land, while every “ drum ecclesiastic” reverberated with the sound of *Church and King* for ever ! The charming doctrines of *non-resistance* and *passive obedience* were interwoven with all the public decrees of our universities ; and even acts of parliament (the act of uniformity, for instance) recognized them as the laws of God and the Constitution ; nor was it till the following reign of James the II. that our reverend Prelates discovered that they admitted of *one single* exception, *viz.* when their own interests were in danger †. After this, however, the same doctrines were again revived in the latter part of the reign of the glorious Queen Anne ; nor are they by any means extinct at present ; but are at least twice every year (on the 31st of January and 29th of May) publicly and solemnly promulgated by almost all the dignified clergy, and by so many of the inferior as are ambitious to rank among their betters.—But I have wandered from my

* Flower on the French Convention, p. 391

† See Milton's Defence of the People of England,

subject, and must return to finish the panegyric of our once beloved King; the ground of which I have already given you in reciting the most memorable incidents of his reign and government.

I might here compare him to the heroes—the sages—the saints of ancient times—but that I am aware he could derive no great honour from the comparison. I might ascribe to him the comeliness of Saul, the valour of David, the wisdom of Solomon, and the piety of Josias: but as these topics have been already exhausted by my brethren of the clergy, I would rather express his eulogium in more modern terms, and terms I apprehend more just and suitable. As a private person then, he was the most polite gentleman of his court, and the most agreeable companion. He was also a most pleasant wit, and for gallantry, even Solomon himself in some respects must yield to him: For though the King of Israel might perhaps keep more ladies in his seraglio, it is not likely he devoted so much of his attention and the nation's money to their service.

In his public character we have already marked a majestic dignity, and a religious zeal as the most striking features. However, in private life, he might sometimes stoop to familiarity with the lowest of his subjects; yet in public he knew how to maintain his authority with a proper degree of inflexibility, and support the rights of Kings and

Bishops in the face of both Houses of Parliament. And as to ecclesiastics, it is most certain, that though his Majesty treated with a most righteous severity all factious and disaffected clergymen, yet was he no less courteous and condescending to those who were submissive, and acknowledged him their head in church as well as state,—a most suitable head for such a body as the then church of England!

In fine, he was a most gracious and religious King---the defender of *our* faith, and his *own* prerogatives; and his name will be dear, particularly to the clergy, so long as they enjoy the benefits and emoluments they recovered by his restoration; or, in the beautiful language of my text, his “Remembrance is like the composition of the perfume that is made by the art of the Apothecary: it is as sweet as honey in all mouths, and as music at a banquet of wine.”

F I N I S.

This Day is published, by the same Author, Price 6d.

THE FIFTH EDITION OF THE

SHAVER'S NEW SERMON,

FOR THE

F A S T D A Y:

With a Defence of the present War!

1928

1928

1928